



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,516	05/29/2001	David Boreham	P5832	7454

7590 06/12/2003
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two N. Market st.
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,516

Applicant(s)

BOREHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen T Le

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract

1. The abstract is objected to because it contains the phraseology "disclosure".

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 8-10, 12, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because:

- at claims 8, 9, 10, 12, 21, 22, 23, it is not clear what "the target entry" refers to
- at claims 10, 12, 23, it is not clear what "an entry" refers to.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 12, 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - claim 12 contains a typographical error at line 1. Furthermore, "the method" should be – a method—
 - claim 19, "the method as in claim 14" should be – the apparatus as in claim 14--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hardy et al (US 6,073,242).

Regarding claim 1, Hardy discloses all the claimed subject matter (see the abstract, Figures 1, 4). The claimed “encapsulating distinguishing names corresponding to one or more roles to be nested” merely reads on the fact that users are associated with one or more roles in the method of Hardy. Furthermore, the roles are clearly “to be nested” since a user can have more than one role for example a user is both an employee in an enterprise and the president of the enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 14, line 6).

Regarding claim 2, the claimed “wherein the encapsulation is expressed by adding the DNs to be nested to a predefined attribute” merely reads on the fact that the distinguished name of a user is added to a role category for example as a manager. The method of Hardy has to operate in that manner since the method is role-based (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 4, the claimed managed role type merely reads on the administrator in the method of Hardy who updates the roles (see column 10, lines 64-67).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 5, the claimed enumerated role type merely reads on the fact that a user can have multiple roles in the method of Hardy (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 6, the claimed filtered role type merely reads on the implicit authorities associated with a role for example a junior engineer is not likely to be given check signing authority (see column 12, lines 16-28).

Regarding claim 7, the claimed nested role type merely reads on the fact that the president of an enterprise is also an employee of the enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 14, line 6).

Regarding claim 8, the claimed "wherein the encapsulating is performed if the target entry is within the scope of the role" is met by the fact that a DN is associated with roles for which it is intended for example A. Hardy with employee and president, M. Wills with employee and acting president (see column 13, line 62- column 14, line 6).

Regarding claim 9, the claimed "wherein the step of encapsulating is performed if the target entry is within the scope of the role that causes the target entry to possess the nested role" is met by the fact that a DN is associated with roles for which it is intended for example A. Hardy with employee and president, M. Wills with employee and acting president (see column 13, line 62- column 14, line 6). Clearly the role of a president causes the entry of A. Hardy to possess the nested role of an employee.

Regarding claim 10, the claimed method of validating an entry including "verifying a computed attribute to determine if the target entry possess a role contained in the nested role" is met when the method of Hardy determines A. Hardy is a president and

employee of an enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 14, line 6). The computed attribute merely reads on the combination of attributes of employee and president.

Regarding claim 12, the claimed method of validating an entry including "verifying a predefined attribute to determine if the target entry possess a role contained in the nested role" is met when the method of Hardy verifies that A. Hardy is a president of the enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 4, line 6). The predefined attribute merely reads on the attribute of president. The target entry of A. Hardy clearly possesses a role contained in the nested role since a president of an enterprise is also an employee of that enterprise.

Claims 14, 15, 17-23 correspond respectively to a system for method claims 1, 2, 4-10, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 2, 4-10 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 11, 13, 16, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy et al (US 6,073,242).

Regarding claims 3, 11, 13, 16, 24, although Hardy does not specifically show the nsRole and nsRoleDN, the claimed attributes merely read on the fact that any attribute has to have a name. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include any name to an attribute in the method and apparatus of Hardy.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Martin et al (US 5,815,710) teach managing relationships among objects in a distributed environment.

Borgida et al "Loading data into description reasoners ", ACM 1993, pages 217-226.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le
June 9, 2003